

Matthew B. Berry, VA Bar No. 42600
General Counsel
Todd B. Tatelman, VA Bar No. 66008
Deputy General Counsel
Kenneth C. Daines, D.C. Bar No. 1600753
Assistant General Counsel

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
5140 O'Neill House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-9700
Matthew.Berry@mail.house.gov

Counsel for Amicus Curiae, U.S. House of Representatives

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES, et al.

Defendants.

Case No. 4:25-cv-04966-HSG

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
BRIEF OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AS
AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
DISMISS**

Date: January 29, 2026

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

1 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 29, 2026, at 2:00 pm PST, or as soon thereafter
 3 as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 2, 4th Floor, United States District Court, Northern
 4 District of California, located at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, Proposed *Amicus Curiae*
 5 the United States House of Representatives will, and hereby does, move this Court for leave to
 6 file an *amicus curiae* brief in support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended
 7 Complaint in the above-captioned matter, ECF 172, which has been noticed for a hearing on that
 8 date.

9 The U.S. House of Representatives respectfully moves for leave to file the attached brief
 10 as *amicus curiae*.¹ The House has consulted with the Plaintiffs and Defendants, and they have
 11 consented to the filing of this amicus brief. *See also* ECF 161 ¶ 8. A copy of the House’s
 12 proposed *amicus curiae* brief and a proposed order are attached.

13 STATEMENT OF INTEREST

14 The House’s motion for leave to file as *amicus curiae* should be granted because the
 15 House offers a unique perspective on a key issue implicated by claims raised by Plaintiffs here:
 16 Congress’s exclusive constitutional authority to determine its own rules under the Rulemaking
 17 Clause, U.S. Const. art. I, § 5, cl. 2.² The House respectfully submits that its *amicus* brief will aid
 18 the Court’s understanding of the connection between the Congressional Review Act (CRA) and
 19 this core constitutional authority. Specifically, in the instant case, Congress chose to exercise its
 20 rulemaking power by means of the CRA, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 802(g), when it utilized CRA procedures
 21 to nullify California’s Clean Air Act (CAA) preemption waivers. That choice unlocked expedited

22 ¹ The House’s Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group has authorized the filing of this *amicus*
 23 brief. BLAG comprises the Honorable Mike Johnson, Speaker of the House, the Honorable Steve
 24 Scalise, Majority Leader, the Honorable Tom Emmer, Majority Whip, the Honorable Hakeem
 25 Jeffries, Minority Leader, and the Honorable Katherine Clark, Minority Whip, and it “speaks for,
 26 and articulates the institutional position of, the House in all litigation matters.” Rule II.8(b), Rules
 of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (2025), <https://perma.cc/QD7D-WRAX>. The
 Speaker of the House, the Majority Leader, and the Majority Whip voted to support the filing of
 this brief; the Minority Leader and Minority Whip did not.

27 ² As Justice Joseph Story once admonished: “No person can doubt the propriety of the
 28 provision authorizing each house to determine the rules of its own proceedings. If the power did
 not exist, it would be utterly impracticable to transact the business of the nation... .” 2 J. Story,
 Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States § 835, at 298 (1833).

1 parliamentary procedures for considering and passing joint resolutions of disapproval within 60
 2 days of Congress's receipt of the rules, 5 U.S.C. § 802(a), including bypassing a potential Senate
 3 filibuster.

4 With narrow exceptions, Congress's authority to decide the procedural rules by which it
 5 enacts legislation is "*absolute* and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal." *See*
 6 *United States v. Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1, 5 (1892) (emphasis added). Indeed, this is a central reason
 7 why Congress precluded judicial review of actions and determinations made under the CRA in
 8 the first place, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 805. Because many of Plaintiffs' claims here directly challenge
 9 Congress's rulemaking authority, and a judicial order overriding congressional decisions that are
 10 strictly procedural would violate both the CRA itself and separation-of-powers principles, the
 11 House has a compelling institutional interest in this case.³ Its participation as an *amicus* is
 12 necessary to vindicate its interests.⁴

13 ³ Separate from Congress's institutional interest in protecting decisions made under the
 14 CRA and the Rulemaking Clause from judicial review, Congress also has an interest in ensuring
 15 that states comply with the CAA. For example, after joint resolutions were enacted that nullified
 16 California's CAA waivers, the House Committee on Energy and Commerce sent a letter on August
 17 11, 2025, to the California Air Resources Board to determine whether California is still enforcing
 its prior emissions standards that are now preempted by the CAA. Letter from Rep. Brett Guthrie,
 Chairman, H. Comm. on Energy & Com., et al., to Steven S. Cliff, Exec. Officer, Cal. Res. Bd.
 (Aug. 11, 2025), <https://perma.cc/S6X8-6E98>. To date, the California Air Resources Board has
 not satisfied the Committee's request for information.

18 ⁴ The House regularly appears as *amicus curiae* in cases in which its institutional powers
 19 are implicated. *See, e.g.*, Brief of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae, *Sierra Club*
 20 *v. Trump*, No. 4:20-cv-01494-HSG (N.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2020); Memorandum of the U.S. House of
 21 Representatives as Amicus Curiae, *California v. Trump*, 267 F. Supp. 3d 1119 (N.D. Cal. 2017)
 (No. 3:17-cv-05895); Brief for the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae in Support of
 22 Petitioners, *Smith & Wesson Brands, Inc., et al. v. Estados Unidos Mexicanos*, 605 U.S. 280 (2025)
 (No. 23-1141); Brief for the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae in Support of
 23 Petitioners, *Fuld, et al. v. Palestine Liberation Organization, et al.*, 606 U.S. 1 (2025) (No. 24-20);
 Brief for the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners, *Loper*
 24 *Bright Ents., et al. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024) (No. 22-451); Brief for the U.S. House of
 25 Representatives as Amicus Curiae Supporting Respondents, *Patchak v. Zinke*, 138 S. Ct. 897 (2018)
 (No. 16-498); Brief for the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae Supporting Certiorari,
 26 *Sokolow v. Palestinian Liberation Org.*, No. 16-1071 (S. Ct. Apr. 6, 2017); Brief of Amici Curiae
 27 the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives & 225 Individual
 28 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives in Support of Respondents, *Bank Markazi v.*
Peterson, 136 S. Ct. 1310 (2016) (No. 14-770); Brief of Amicus Curiae the Bipartisan Legal
 Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives in Support of Petitioner, *Renzi v. United*
States, No. 11-557 (S. Ct. Dec. 2, 2011); Brief of Amicus Curiae United States House of
 Representatives in Support of Defendant-Appellee and in Support of Affirmance, *Land of Lincoln*
Mut. Health Ins. Co. v. United States, 892 F.3d 1184 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (No. 2017-1224); Brief of

ARGUMENT

This Court may in its “broad discretion” allow the participation of *amicus curiae*, *NetChoice v. Bonta*, 2023 WL 6131619, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2023), and does not impose “strict prerequisites that must be established prior to qualifying for amicus status.” *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litig.*, No. M-02-1486, 2007 WL 2022026, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2007). Rather, “an individual or entity seeking to appear as amicus must merely make a showing that his/its participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court.” *Id.* “The touchstone is whether the amicus is ‘helpful,’ and there is no requirement ‘that amici must be totally disinterested.’” *California v. Dep’t of Labor*, No. 13-cv-02069, 2014 WL 12691095, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2014) (quoting *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982), *abrogation on other grounds recognized by Montijo v. Swaney*, 754 F. App’x 522 (9th Cir. 2018)).

Here, this Court would benefit from briefing by the House because this litigation involves matters directly implicating congressional authority and the separation of powers: a legislative provision expressly precluding judicial review, 5 U.S.C. § 805, and Congress’s constitutional rulemaking authority, U.S. Const. art. I, § 5, cl. 2. The House is well-positioned to provide unique insight regarding both the CRA’s nonreviewability provision and the nonjusticiability of

the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae Supporting Affirmance, *Council of the Dist. of Columbia v. Gray*, 42 F. Supp. 3d 134 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (No. 14-7067); Brief of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae, *United States v. Renzi*, 769 F.3d 731 (9th Cir. 2014) (No. 13-10588); Brief of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae Supporting Affirmance, *Cause of Action v. Nat’l Archives & Records Admin.*, 753 F.3d 210 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (No. 13-5127); Brief of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae Supporting Affirmance of District Court Order Quashing Trial Subpoena on Speech or Debate Clause Grounds, *United States v. Verrusio*, 762 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir., 2013) (No. 11-3080); Brief of Amicus Curiae the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives in Support of Appellant, *United States v. Rainey*, 757 F.3d 234 (5th Cir. 2013) (No. 13-3070); Brief of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae in Support of Neither Party, *United States v. Collins*, No. 1:18-cr-00567 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 4, 2019); Memorandum of Points and Authorities of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives as Amicus Curiae, *Council of the Dist. of Columbia v. Gray*, 42 F. Supp. 3d 134 (D.D.C. 2014) (No. 1:14-cv-00655); *In re Search of The Rayburn House Office Bldg. Room No. 2113*, 432 F. Supp. 2d 100, 104-05 (D.D.C. 2006); *Byrd v. Raines*, 956 F. Supp. 25, 27 (D.D.C. 1997); *United States v. Rose*, 790 F. Supp. 340, 340 (D.D.C. 1992); *United States v. Eichman*, 731 F. Supp. 1123, 1127 n.6 (D.D.C. 1990); *Webster v. Sun Co.*, 561 F. Supp. 1184, 1185-86 (D.D.C. 1983).

1 challenges to congressional decisions under the Rulemaking Clause. In addition, the House is
 2 well-situated to explain why the nullification of California’s CAA waivers was a permissible
 3 exercise of Congress’s legislative power and consistent with the separation of powers.

4 As part of the Legislative Branch, the House offers a perspective distinct from the parties
 5 (including the Executive Branch), which is particularly important given the weighty separation-
 6 of-powers concerns at issue here and the fact that Plaintiffs contend that Congress’s use of the
 7 CRA’s expedited procedures to nullify California’s CAA waivers was unlawful. By addressing
 8 congressional practice and intent regarding the CRA, as well as the Constitution’s protection of
 9 congressional rulemaking from judicial review, the House’s participation will provide the Court
 10 with an important additional perspective regarding this dispute. Accordingly, the House should
 11 be granted leave to participate as *amicus curiae*.

12 CONCLUSION

13 For the foregoing reasons, the House’s motion for leave to file the attached *amicus curiae*
 14 brief should be granted.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 /s/ Matthew B. Berry

17 Matthew B. Berry, VA Bar No. 42600

18 *General Counsel*

19 Todd B. Tatelman, VA Bar No. 66008

20 *Deputy General Counsel*

21 Kenneth C. Daines, D.C. Bar No. 1600753

22 *Assistant General Counsel*

23 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

24 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

25 5140 O’Neill House Office Building

26 Washington, D.C. 20515

27 (202) 225-9700

28 Matthew.Berry@mail.house.gov

November 24, 2025

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae the United States House
 of Representatives⁵*

⁵ Attorneys for the Office of General Counsel for the U.S. House of Representatives and
 “any counsel specially retained by the Office of General Counsel” are “entitled, for the purpose of
 performing the counsel’s functions, to enter an appearance in any proceeding before any court of
 the United States or of any State or political subdivision thereof without compliance with any
 requirements for admission to practice before such court.” 2 U.S.C. § 5571.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 24, 2025, I caused the foregoing document to be filed via the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California's CM/ECF system, which I understand caused service on all registered parties.

/s/ Matthew B. Berry
Matthew B. Berry